

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has added a new paragraph to page 1 of the specification entitled "Cross reference to related application" and has amended the abstract, as requested by the Examiner. The Applicant submits that this amendment introduces now new matter.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 27, 28, 30 and 36 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to resolve the clarity issues raised.

Claim rejections

Independent claims 1, 19 and 28 and their respective dependent claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Kubby (USPN 5,706,041) in view of Yamashita et al. (USPN 5,969,005). With respect, Applicant disagrees.

Kubby teaches an inkjet printer nozzle construction but does not teach that the nozzle construction is capable of ejecting ink at less than 4 nanograms per drop. Yamashita teaches an ink that can be used in ink jet printing which can perform suitably as an ink when ejected at between 1 and 70 nanograms per drop. However Yamashita does not teach any elements of a printer that can perform drop ejection at less than 4 nanograms per drop.

For the combination of Kubby and Yamashita to render the present claims obvious, the combination of Kubby and Yamashita would need to teach elements of a printer that make the printer capable of ejecting ink at less than 4 nanograms per drop. However, neither Kubby nor Yamashita disclose such elements of a printer. That Yamashita teaches an ink that performs when used at less than 4 nanograms per drop does not necessarily alter the weight per drop at which the Kubby printer can operate. The combination of Kubby and Yamashita would only allow the printer to print at a weight per drop for which the Kubby printer is suitable. Since Kubby does not teach a weight per drop within the range presently claimed in claim 1, the Applicant considers that the claims are not rendered obvious by Kubby and Yamashita in combination. Furthermore, since Applicant has disclosed in the description a construction of a printer that is suitable for printing at the weight per drop

presently claimed, the Applicant considers that the scope of the claims in their present form is allowable.

Therefore, in the absence of any teachings of an inkjet printer construction capable of ejecting ink at less than 4 nanograms per drop, the Applicant considers that the independent claims 1, 19 and 38 are patentably distinguished over Kubby and Yamashita, either in isolation or in combination, and that the rejection of these claims is hereby traversed.

Further, as each of the remaining rejected claims is dependent on either claim 1, 19 or 38, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the claims remaining for consideration in the present application is distinguished from the cited prior art for the reasons outlined above.

Applicant considers that this response is fully responsive to each of the issues raised in the Office Action and that by the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is placed in condition for allowance. Further consideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762